

Strong External Difference Families and Classification of α -valuations

Donald L. Kreher¹, Maura B. Paterson², and Douglas R. Stinson^{*3}

¹Department of Mathematical Sciences, Michigan Technological University
Houghton, MI 49931-1295, U.S.A.

²School of Computing and Mathematical Sciences, Birkbeck, University of London,
Malet St, London WC1E 7HX, UK

³David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science, University of Waterloo, Waterloo
ON, N2L 3G1, Canada

June 14, 2024

Abstract

One method of constructing $(a^2 + 1, 2, a, 1)$ -SEDFs (i.e., strong external difference families) in \mathbb{Z}_{a^2+1} makes use of α -valuations of complete bipartite graphs $K_{a,a}$. We explore this approach and we provide a classification theorem which shows that all such α -valuations can be constructed recursively via a sequence of “blow-up” operations. We also enumerate all $(a^2 + 1, 2, a, 1)$ -SEDFs in \mathbb{Z}_{a^2+1} for $a \leq 14$ and we show that all these SEDFs are equivalent to α -valuations via affine transformations. Whether this holds for all $a > 14$ as well is an interesting open problem. We also study SEDFs in dihedral groups, where we show that two known constructions are equivalent.

1 Introduction

Definition 1.1 ([14]). A β -valuation of a graph G with n edges is a one-to-one map \mathcal{V} of the vertices into the set of integers $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$, such that, if we label each edge by the absolute value of the differences of the labels of the corresponding vertices, then the resulting edge labels are precisely the elements of the set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. (This is also known as a *graceful labelling*.)

Definition 1.2 ([14]). An α -valuation of a graph G with n edges is a β -valuation that satisfies the additional condition that there is some value x with $0 \leq x \leq n$ such that each edge is incident with one vertex whose label is at most x , and one whose label is greater than x .

*D.R. Stinson’s research is supported by NSERC discovery grant RGPIN-03882.

A graph with an α -valuation \mathcal{V} is necessarily bipartite, with the partition given by the set V^{large} , which consists of vertices whose labels are larger than x , and V^{small} , which consists of vertices whose labels are at most x . Note that the value of x is uniquely determined, as the edge whose vertices have difference 1 must have labels x and $x + 1$. For convenience, we will write $\mathcal{V} = (V^{\text{small}}, V^{\text{large}})$.

It is often convenient to identify the vertices and their labels, and we will do this throughout the paper.

Example 1.1. [14] We obtain an α -valuation of the complete bipartite graph $K_{a,a}$ by defining $V^{\text{small}} = \{0, 1, \dots, a - 1\}$ and $V^{\text{large}} = \{a, 2a, \dots, a^2\}$.

Lemma 1.1. *Let $(V^{\text{small}}, V^{\text{large}})$ be an α -valuation of a complete bipartite graph. Then there do not exist distinct elements $x, y \in V^{\text{small}}$ and distinct $u, v \in V^{\text{large}}$ with $x - y = u - v$.*

Proof. If we had $x, y \in V^{\text{small}}$ with $x - y = d$ and $u, v \in V^{\text{large}}$ with $u - v = d$ for $d \neq 0$, then we would have

$$\begin{aligned} u - x &= (v + d) - (y + d), \\ &= v - y, \end{aligned}$$

which cannot occur in an α -valuation. □

Let a, b be positive integers. We define $\Phi_{ab}: \{0, 1, 2, \dots, ab\} \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2, \dots, ab\}$ by setting $\Phi_{ab}(x) = ab - x$. Then Φ_{ab} is bijective, and $\Phi_{ab}^2(x) = x$ for all $x \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, ab\}$.

Definition 1.3. Let \mathcal{V}_1 and \mathcal{V}_2 be α -valuations of the complete bipartite graph $K_{a,b}$. We say that \mathcal{V}_1 and \mathcal{V}_2 are *equivalent* if $\mathcal{V}_1 = \mathcal{V}_2$, or if for each vertex in $K_{a,b}$, the label in \mathcal{V}_2 is obtained by applying Φ_{ab} to its label in \mathcal{V}_1 .

We observe that when \mathcal{V}_1 and \mathcal{V}_2 are equivalent, Φ_{ab} maps the labels of V^{small} for \mathcal{V}_1 to the labels of V^{large} for \mathcal{V}_2 , and vice versa.

1.1 Our contributions

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we show that α -valuations of $K_{a,b}$ have a rich structure and we prove a classification theorem for them. In particular, we show that all α -valuations of $K_{a,b}$ can be constructed by a sequence of the ‘‘blowup’’ operations that were described in [13]. In Section 3, we turn our attention to strong external difference families (SEDFs) consisting of two sets of size a in \mathbb{Z}_{a^2+1} . We enumerate all such SEDFs for $a \leq 14$ and show that they are all equivalent to α -valuations of $K_{a,a}$. In Section 4, we review two constructions for SEDFs in dihedral groups and we show that they are equivalent.

2 Classification of α -valuations of $K_{a,b}$

The following is our main classification theorem.

Theorem 2.1. *Let \mathcal{V} be an α -valuation of $K_{a,b}$ with $ab > 1$. Then there exists a positive integer $\ell \geq 2$ such that \mathcal{V} is equivalent to an α -valuation with the following properties:*

1. *The elements of V^{large} are all multiples of ℓ .*
2. *The set V^{small} is a union of “runs” of ℓ consecutive integers, where each run starts with a multiple of ℓ .*

We prove Theorem 2.1 by proving a sequence of lemmas.

Lemma 2.2. *Let \mathcal{V} be an α -valuation of $K_{a,b}$ with $ab > 1$. Then $ab \in V^{\text{large}}$ and $0 \in V^{\text{small}}$.*

Proof. The only way to obtain the difference ab is as $ab - 0$, where $ab \in V^{\text{large}}$ and $0 \in V^{\text{small}}$. \square

Lemma 2.3. *Under the same hypotheses as Theorem 2.1, there is an integer $\ell \geq 2$ such that \mathcal{V} is equivalent to an α -valuation that satisfies the following properties, where x is the largest element $x \in V^{\text{small}}$.*

1. $x + 1, x + \ell + 1 \in V^{\text{large}}$,
2. $x + 2, \dots, x + \ell \notin V^{\text{large}}$,
3. $x - 1, x - 2, \dots, x - \ell + 1 \in V^{\text{small}}$, and
4. $x - \ell \notin V^{\text{small}}$.

Proof. Consider the difference 1. It must occur as $1 = (x + 1) - x$, where x is the largest element of V^{small} and $x + 1$ is the smallest element of V^{large} .

The difference 2 can only occur in two possible ways:

case 1: $2 = (x + 2) - x$, or

case 2: $2 = (x + 1) - (x - 1)$.

Only one of these possibilities actually occurs because every difference only occurs once.

We show that the two cases are equivalent. Assume the second case holds and suppose we apply Φ_{ab} . Then $x \mapsto ab - x$ and $x + 1 \mapsto ab - x - 1$. In the transformed valuation, $V^{\text{small}} \subseteq \{0, \dots, y\}$ and $V^{\text{large}} \subseteq \{y + 1, \dots, ab\}$, where $y = ab - x - 1$. The transformation Φ_{ab} also switches case 1 and case 2. If we are in case 1, the difference $2 = (x + 2) - x$ is mapped to $2 = (y + 1) - (y - 1)$. If we are in case 2, the difference $2 = (x + 1) - (x - 1)$ is mapped to $2 = (y + 2) - y$.

Therefore we assume without loss of generality (applying Φ_{ab} if necessary) that case 2 holds; hence $x - 1 \in V^{\text{small}}$ and $x + 2 \notin V^{\text{large}}$.

Let ℓ be the smallest positive integer such that $x - \ell \notin V^{\text{small}}$. Then $x, x - 1, \dots, x - \ell + 1 \in V^{\text{small}}$. Note that $\ell > 1$.

We have already proven 3. and 4. To prove 2., we note that pairs of elements $x, x - 1, \dots, x - \ell + 1 \in V^{\text{small}}$ yield differences $1, \dots, \ell - 1$. Then, from Lemma 1.1, $x + 2, \dots, x + \ell \notin V^{\text{large}}$ because $x + 1 \in V^{\text{large}}$.

To complete the proof, we note that the only way that the difference $\ell + 1$ can possibly occur is $\ell + 1 = (x + \ell + 1) - x$, so $x + \ell + 1 \in V^{\text{large}}$. \square

So far, we have the following partial structure, where red text is used to denote elements that are *not* in the relevant sets V^{small} or V^{large} :

V^{small}	V^{large}
$x - \ell$	$x + \ell + 1$
$x - \ell + 1$	$x + \ell$
$x - \ell + 2$	$x + \ell - 1$
\vdots	\vdots
$x - 1$	$x + 2$
x	$x + 1$

Note that there is a run of ℓ consecutive elements in V^{small} and a difference ℓ between consecutive elements in V^{large} . This pattern continues, as we show in the next lemmas.

Lemma 2.4. *Under the same hypotheses as Theorem 2.1, \mathcal{V} is equivalent to an α -valuation in which no run of elements in V^{small} has length greater than ℓ .*

Proof. Suppose $a, a - 1, \dots, a - k \in V^{\text{small}}$ with $k \geq \ell$. Then, in particular, $a, a - \ell \in V^{\text{small}}$. We also have $x + 1, x + \ell + 1 \in V^{\text{large}}$. Because $a - (a - \ell) = \ell = x + \ell + 1 - (x + 1)$, Lemma 1.1 is violated. We conclude that all runs of elements of V^{small} have length at most ℓ . \square

Lemma 2.5. *Under the same hypotheses as Theorem 2.1, \mathcal{V} is equivalent to an α -valuation in which every element of V^{small} occurs as part of a run of exactly ℓ consecutive elements.*

Proof. Lemma 2.4 establishes that no run in V^{small} can have length greater than ℓ . Suppose that there is a run in V^{small} having length less than ℓ . Let a be the largest element of V^{small} that does not occur in a run of ℓ consecutive elements. Let b be the largest element less than a that does not occur in the run containing a . Then $b + 1, \dots, a$ is a (maximal) run of length $a - b < \ell$.

Consider the difference $(x + 1) - b$. This difference must occur in the α -valuation as a difference $y - z$ with $y \in V^{\text{large}}$ and $z \in V^{\text{small}}$. Also, we have

$$z = y - (x + 1) + b > y - (x + 1) + a - \ell.$$

It is impossible that $y = x + 1$ because then $z = b$ and $b \notin V^{\text{small}}$. Hence, $y \geq x + \ell + 1$ and then $z > a$.

If $z + (a - b) \in V^{\text{small}}$ then

$$y - (z + (a - b)) = (y - z) - a + b = (x + 1) - a.$$

However, as $x + 1 \in V^{\text{large}}$, $a \in V^{\text{small}}$ and $y \neq x + 1$, this implies the α -valuation has a repeat of the difference $x + 1 - a$. Hence, $z + (a - b) \notin V^{\text{small}}$.

We have $z > a$, so z is contained in a run of ℓ consecutive elements of V^{small} , say the run $d, d + 1, \dots, d + \ell - 1$. Hence $a + 2 \leq d \leq z \leq d + \ell - 1$. Also, $z + (a - b) \geq d + \ell$ because $z + (a - b) \notin V^{\text{small}}$. This implies $z + (a - b) - \ell \geq d$. Because $z + (a - b) - \ell < z$, we must have $z + (a - b) - \ell \in V^{\text{small}}$.

We have

$$y - (z + (a - b) - \ell) = x + 1 - b - a + b + \ell = x + \ell + 1 - a.$$

As $x + \ell + 1 \in V^{\text{large}}$, this too is a repeated difference in the α -valuation unless $y = x + \ell + 1$ and $z + (a - b) - \ell = a$.

Assume $z + (a - b) - \ell = a$. Then $z + a - b = a + \ell$. We have $z + (a - b) \notin V^{\text{small}}$, so $a + \ell = z + a - b \geq d + \ell$. This implies $a \geq d$, which is clearly impossible because $a \leq d - 2$. \square

We now consider the differences between consecutive runs of V^{small} . Suppose the smallest element of one run in V^{small} is s and the smallest element in the next run is $s + d$. We refer to this as a *gap of length d* . Note that a gap of length d means that there are $d - \ell$ consecutive elements that are *not* in V^{small} , namely, $s + \ell, \dots, s + d - 1$.

Lemma 2.6. *Under the same hypotheses as Theorem 2.1, \mathcal{V} is equivalent to an α -valuation in which the gaps between consecutive runs of elements of V^{small} all have lengths that are multiples of ℓ .*

Proof. Suppose there is a gap of length d between two consecutive runs in V^{small} , where $d \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\ell}$. Let these runs consist of elements

$$s, \dots, s + \ell - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad t, \dots, t + \ell - 1,$$

where $t = s + d$. The $d - \ell$ consecutive elements $s + \ell, \dots, s + d - 1$ are not in V^{small} .

Consider the $d - \ell$ consecutive differences in the set

$$\mathcal{D} = \{x + 1 - (s + \ell), \dots, x + 1 - (t - 1)\}.$$

For every difference $y - z$ with $y \in V^{\text{large}}$ and $z \in V^{\text{small}}$, we obtain ℓ consecutive differences because z is contained in a run of size ℓ . It is clearly impossible to cover all the differences in \mathcal{D} with disjoint runs of ℓ consecutive differences, because $d \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\ell}$. \square

Because all the runs of elements of V^{small} have length ℓ and $|V^{\text{small}}| = a$, it follows that $a \equiv 0 \pmod{\ell}$.

Lemma 2.7. *Under the same hypotheses as Theorem 2.1, \mathcal{V} is equivalent to an α -valuation where x is the largest element $x \in V^{\text{small}}$ satisfies the congruence $x + 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{\ell}$. Further, the largest element in any run in V^{small} is congruent to -1 modulo ℓ .*

Proof. All the runs in V^{small} have length ℓ and all the gaps have lengths that are a multiple of ℓ . The first run starts at 0, from Lemma 2.2. Hence every run of elements of V^{small} has the form $d, d + 1, \dots, d + \ell - 1$ where $d \equiv 0 \pmod{\ell}$. Because the last run is $x - \ell + 1, \dots, x$, it follows that $x - \ell + 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{\ell}$, or $x + 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{\ell}$. \square

Lemma 2.8. *Under the same hypotheses as Theorem 2.1, \mathcal{V} is equivalent to an α -valuation in which the elements of V^{large} are all multiples of ℓ .*

Proof. We have shown that $x + 1$, the smallest element in V^{large} , is divisible by ℓ . Suppose that V^{large} contains at least one element that is not divisible by ℓ , and let w be the smallest such element. We can write $w = x + 1 + il + d$, where $0 < d < \ell$. Note that $w = x + 1 + il \notin V^{\text{large}}$, because then d would be an internal difference in V^{large} ; this is not possible from Lemma 1.1 because $1, \dots, \ell - 1$ are all internal differences in V^{small} .

Consider the difference $il + 1$. This must occur as a difference $y - z$ with $y \in V^{\text{large}}$ and $z \in V^{\text{small}}$. Note that $x + 1 + il - x = il + 1$. We cannot have $y = x + 1 + il$, because $x + 1 + il \notin V^{\text{large}}$. Hence $z < x$ and $y < x + 1 + il$, because x is the largest element in V^{small} . By assumption, y must be a multiple of ℓ , so $z \equiv -1 \pmod{\ell}$. It follows from the Lemmas 2.5 and 2.7 that $z - d \in V^{\text{small}}$. We have $y - (z - d) = d + il + 1 = w - x$. Because $y < x + 1 + il < w$, we have two occurrences of the difference $d + il + 1$, which is impossible. We conclude that all elements of V^{large} are multiples of ℓ . \square

Now we can complete the proof of our main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. This is an immediate consequence of Lemmas 2.2–2.8. \square

If we apply Φ_{ab} to an α -valuation of $K_{a,b}$ having the properties stated in Theorem 2.1, we obtain an equivalent α -valuation that satisfies the following properties.

Theorem 2.9. *Let \mathcal{V} be an α -valuation of $K_{a,b}$ with $ab > 1$. Then there exists a positive integer $\ell > 1$ such that \mathcal{V} is equivalent to an α -valuation with the following properties:*

1. *The elements of V^{small} are all multiples of ℓ .*
2. *The set V^{large} is a union of “runs” of ℓ consecutive integers that end with a multiple of ℓ .*

We will call an α -valuation that satisfies the properties listed in Theorem 2.1 a *type I* α -valuation, while one that satisfies the properties listed in Theorem 2.9 will be termed a *type II* α -valuation.

Example 2.1. Suppose $a = b = 3$, $V^{\text{small}} = \{0, 1, 2\}$ and $V^{\text{large}} = \{3, 6, 9\}$. This is a type I α -valuation of $K_{3,3}$ with $\ell = 3$. It is equivalent to the type II α -valuation consisting of $V^{\text{small}} = \{0, 3, 6\}$ and $V^{\text{large}} = \{7, 8, 9\}$.

We describe two “projection” operations.

Theorem 2.10 (PROJECTION I). *Suppose V^{small} and V^{large} form a type I α -valuation \mathcal{V} of $K_{a,b}$. Replace every element $y \in V^{\text{large}}$ by y/ℓ and call the resulting set W^{large} . Also, replace every run $R = il, il + 1, \dots, il + \ell - 1$ in V^{small} by the single element i and call the resulting set W^{small} . Then W^{small} and W^{large} form an α -valuation \mathcal{W} of $K_{a/\ell, b}$.*

Proof. It is clear that $W^{\text{small}} \subseteq \{0, \dots, m/\ell - 1\}$ and $W^{\text{large}} \subseteq \{m/\ell, \dots, ab/\ell\}$. Further, $|W^{\text{small}}| = |V^{\text{small}}|/\ell = a/\ell$ and $|W^{\text{large}}| = |V^{\text{large}}| = b$. Now, consider the differences in the valuation \mathcal{V} obtained from an element $y \in V^{\text{large}}$ and the run R :

$$y - il, y - (il + 1), \dots, y - (il + \ell - 1).$$

In the valuation \mathcal{W} , we get the single difference $y/\ell - i$. We know that

$$\{y - r : y \in V^{\text{large}}, r \in V^{\text{small}}\} = \{1, \dots, ab\}.$$

It is therefore easy to see that

$$\{y' - z : y' \in W^{\text{large}}, z \in W^{\text{small}}\} = \{1, \dots, ab/\ell\}.$$

Finally, every element of W^{large} is greater than every element of W^{small} . Hence, W^{small} and W^{large} form an α -valuation \mathcal{W} of $K_{a/\ell, b}$. \square

The following result is proven in a similar manner. We leave the details for the reader to verify.

Theorem 2.11 (PROJECTION II). *Suppose V^{small} and V^{large} form a type II α -valuation \mathcal{V} of $K_{a,b}$. Replace every element $y \in V^{\text{small}}$ by y/ℓ and call the resulting set W^{small} . Then, replace every run $i\ell - \ell + 1, i\ell - \ell + 2, \dots, i\ell$ in V^{large} by the single element i and call the resulting set W^{large} . Then W^{small} and W^{large} form an α -valuation \mathcal{W} of $K_{a,b/\ell}$.*

After having computed W^{small} and W^{large} using a projection operation, we have a “smaller” α -valuation. We can then project this smaller α -valuation. The process continues until we reach a trivial α -valuation of $K_{1,1}$.

Example 2.2. Again, suppose $a = b = 3$, $V^{\text{small}} = \{0, 1, 2\}$ and $V^{\text{large}} = \{3, 6, 9\}$. This is a type I α -valuation of $K_{3,3}$ with $\ell = 3$. If we project this α -valuation, we obtain the α -valuation consisting of $W^{\text{small}} = \{0\}$ and $W^{\text{large}} = \{1, 2, 3\}$. This is a type II α -valuation of $K_{1,3}$ with $\ell = 3$. If we then project this α -valuation, we obtain the α -valuation of $K_{1,1}$ consisting of $X^{\text{small}} = \{0\}$ and $X^{\text{large}} = \{1\}$.

2.1 Blowup Operations

The lexicographic product $G \cdot K_\ell^c$ replaces every vertex of a graph G by ℓ independent vertices and it replaces every edge xy by ℓ^2 edges joining the ℓ copies of x to the ℓ copies of y . In [13] two “blowing-up” operations were described, which were used to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 2.12. *Suppose a graph G has an α -valuation, and let $\ell \geq 2$. Then $G \cdot K_\ell^c$ has an α -valuation.*

When G is a complete bipartite graph, the blowing-up operations described in [13] constitute inverses to the two projection operations described above. We describe these now.

Theorem 2.13 (BLOWUP I). *Suppose W^{small} and W^{large} form an α -valuation of $K_{a,b}$. Let $\ell > 1$ be an integer. Then there is an α -valuation of $K_{\ell a, b}$.*

Proof. First, multiply every element in $W^{\text{small}} \cup W^{\text{large}}$ by ℓ . Then, for every element $li \in V^{\text{small}}$, replace it by the ℓ elements $\{li, li + 1, \dots, li + (\ell - 1)\}$. We obtain an α -valuation of $K_{\ell a, b}$. \square

Theorem 2.14 (BLOWUP II). *Suppose W^{small} and W^{large} form an α -valuation of $K_{a,b}$. Let $\ell > 1$ be an integer. Then there is an α -valuation of $K_{a,\ell b}$.*

Proof. First, multiply every element in $W^{\text{small}} \cup W^{\text{large}}$ by ℓ . Then, for every element $li \in V^{\text{large}}$, replace it by the ℓ elements $\{li, li - 1, \dots, li - (\ell - 1)\}$. We obtain an α -valuation of $K_{a,\ell b}$. \square

If we are applying a sequence of Blowup operations, can assume without loss of generality that we will alternate Blowup operations of types I and II. This is because consecutive Blowup operations of same type can be replaced by a single Blowup operation. For example, BLOWUP I with ℓ_1 , followed by BLOWUP I with ℓ_2 , is identical to BLOWUP I with $\ell_1\ell_2$.

It is easy to see that if we start with an α -valuation of $K_{a,b}$ and we perform BLOWUP I (BLOWUP II, respectively) followed by PROJECTION I (PROJECTION II, respectively) using the same value of ℓ , then we recover the initial α -valuation. Similarly, if we start with an α -valuation of $K_{a,b}$ and we perform PROJECTION I (PROJECTION II, respectively) followed by BLOWUP I (BLOWUP II, respectively) using the same value of ℓ , then we recover the initial α -valuation.

The above discussion immediately yields the following classification theorem.

Theorem 2.15. *Every α -valuation of $K_{a,b}$ can be obtained from the trivial α -valuation of $K_{1,1}$ by an alternating sequence of BLOWUP I and BLOWUP II operations.*

Example 2.3. Suppose we start with the trivial α -valuation of $K_{1,1}$ consisting of $\{0\}$ and $\{1\}$. Now apply two blowup operations with $\ell = 4$, in the order BLOWUP II, BLOWUP I. We obtain the following:

operation	V^{small}	V^{large}
	$\{0\}$	$\{1\}$
BLOWUP II $\ell = 4$	$\{0\}$ $\{0\}$	$\{4\}$ $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$
BLOWUP I $\ell = 4$	$\{0\}$ $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}$	$\{4, 8, 12, 16\}$ $\{4, 8, 12, 16\}$

The result is the α -valuation obtained from Example 1.1.

Example 2.4. Suppose we start with the trivial α -valuation of $K_{1,1}$ consisting of $\{0\}$ and $\{1\}$. Now apply four blowup operations, all with $\ell = 2$, in the order BLOWUP II, BLOWUP I, BLOWUP II, BLOWUP I. We obtain the following:

operation	V^{small}	V^{large}
	$\{0\}$	$\{1\}$
BLOWUP II $\ell = 2$	$\{0\}$ $\{0\}$	$\{2\}$ $\{1, 2\}$
BLOWUP I $\ell = 2$	$\{0\}$ $\{0, 1\}$	$\{2, 4\}$ $\{2, 4\}$
BLOWUP II $\ell = 2$	$\{0, 2\}$ $\{0, 2\}$	$\{4, 8\}$ $\{3, 4, 7, 8\}$
BLOWUP I $\ell = 2$	$\{0, 4\}$ $\{0, 1, 4, 5\}$	$\{6, 8, 14, 16\}$ $\{6, 8, 14, 16\}$

Example 2.5. Suppose we start with the trivial α -valuation of $K_{1,1}$ consisting of $\{0\}$ and $\{1\}$. Now apply three blowup operations, in the order BLOWUP II with $\ell = 2$, BLOWUP I with $\ell = 4$, and BLOWUP II with $\ell = 2$. We obtain the following:

operation	V^{small}	V^{large}
	$\{0\}$	$\{1\}$
BLOWUP II $\ell = 2$	$\{0\}$ $\{0\}$	$\{2\}$ $\{1, 2\}$
BLOWUP I $\ell = 4$	$\{0\}$ $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}$	$\{4, 8\}$ $\{4, 8\}$
BLOWUP II $\ell = 2$	$\{0, 2\}$ $\{0, 2, 4, 6\}$	$\{4, 8\}$ $\{7, 8, 15, 16\}$

3 Strong external difference families and α -valuations of $K_{a,a}$

In this section, we consider the connections between certain strong external difference families and α -valuations of $K_{a,a}$. We begin with some relevant definitions.

For two disjoint subsets A, B of an additive group G , define the multiset $\mathcal{D}(B, A)$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{D}(B, A) = \{y - x : y \in B, x \in A\}.$$

Definition 3.1 ([12]). Let G be an additive group of order n . Suppose $m \geq 2$. An $(n, m, \ell; \lambda)$ -strong external difference family (or $(n, m, \ell; \lambda)$ -SEDF) is a set of m disjoint ℓ -subsets of G , say $\mathcal{A} = (A_0, \dots, A_{m-1})$, such that the following multiset equation holds for each $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}$:

$$\bigcup_{j \neq i} \mathcal{D}(A_i, A_j) = \lambda(G \setminus \{0\}).$$

Since they were first defined in 2016, there have been numerous papers that have studied SEDFs. Some references include [1, 3, 5, 9, 10, 11, 15]. Here, we will focus mainly on $(n, 2, \ell; 1)$ -SEDFs in cyclic groups \mathbb{Z}_n . For SEDFs with these parameters, we must have $n = \ell^2 + 1$.

The proof of the following lemma is immediate.

Lemma 3.1. *An α -valuation of $K_{a,a}$ is an $(a^2 + 1, 2, a; 1)$ -SEDF in the cyclic group \mathbb{Z}_{a^2+1} .*

Remark 3.2. Analogously, an α -valuation of $K_{a,b}$ with $a \neq b$ gives rise to a so-called *generalised SEDF* (or GSEDF) in the cyclic group \mathbb{Z}_{ab+1} . This GSEDF has two sets, one of size a and one of size b . In the rest of this paper, we will focus on the SEDF case (i.e., $a = b$).

We now consider the notion of equivalence of SEDFs.

Definition 3.2 ([12]). Suppose that (A_0, A_1) and (B_0, B_1) are $(n, 2, \ell; 1)$ -SEDFs in \mathbb{Z}_n . We say that these two SEDFs are *affine equivalent* (or, more briefly, *equivalent*) if there exist $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_n^*$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{Z}_n$ such that

1. $B_i = \alpha A_i + \beta$, for $i = 1, 2$, or

2. $B_i = \alpha A_{1-i} + \beta$, for $i = 1, 2$.

The second part of this definition simply allows us to switch the roles of A_0 and A_1 .

Note that equivalence of α -valuations, as defined in Definition 1.3, is a special case of (affine) equivalence of SEDFs.

Example 3.1. Consider the α -valuation from Example 2.5 consisting of $\{0, 2, 4, 6\}$ and $\{7, 8, 15, 16\}$. Under the mapping $x \mapsto 9x \bmod 17$, we obtain $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ and $\{4, 8, 12, 16\}$, which is the α -valuation from Example 2.3.

Example 3.2. In [4], Huczynska, Jefferson and Nepřinská establish that there are precisely two inequivalent $(17, 2, 4; 1)$ -SEDFs in \mathbb{Z}_{17} , namely,

$$\{0, 1, 2, 3\} \quad \text{and} \quad \{4, 8, 12, 16\};$$

and

$$\{1, 4, 13, 16\} \quad \text{and} \quad \{2, 8, 9, 15\}.$$

The first SEDF is the α -valuation from Example 2.3 (see also Example 1.1). The second SEDF is not an α -valuation, but it is equivalent to an α -valuation. The affine function $x \mapsto 6x + 11 \bmod 17$ transforms the second SEDF to $\{0, 1, 4, 5\}$ and $\{6, 8, 14, 16\}$, which is the α -valuation from Example 2.4.

Example 3.3. It is interesting to observe that different blowup sequences can yield equivalent SEDFs. The blowup sequence $(3, 2, 2, 3)$ generates the SEDF consisting of

$$\{0, 1, 2, 6, 7, 8\} \quad \text{and} \quad \{9, 12, 21, 24, 33, 36\}.$$

The SEDF generated from blowup sequence $(2, 3, 3, 2)$ is

$$\{0, 1, 6, 7, 12, 13\} \quad \text{and} \quad \{14, 16, 18, 32, 34, 36\}.$$

If we apply the mapping $x \mapsto 6x + 2 \bmod 37$ to the second SEDF, we obtain the first SEDF.

In a similar manner, it can be shown that the two blowup sequences $(2, 2, 3, 3)$ and $(3, 3, 2, 2)$ generate equivalent SEDFs, as do the three blowup sequences $(2, 6, 3)$, $(3, 6, 2)$ and $(6, 6)$.

3.1 Enumeration of SEDFs

Our enumeration depends on some interesting structural results that were proven in [2]. The paper [2] studies *near-factorizations* of finite groups. A near-factorization of an additive group G is a pair of (disjoint) subsets of G , say (S, T) , such that $S + T = G \setminus \{0\}$. It is clear that (A, B) is an $(a^2 + 1, 2, a; 1)$ -SEDF in \mathbb{Z}_{a^2+1} if and only if $(A, -B)$ is a near-factorization of \mathbb{Z}_{a^2+1} with $|A| = |B| = a$. Similarly, if (A, B) is a GSEDF in \mathbb{Z}_{ab+1} with $|A| = a$ and $|B| = b$, then $(A, -B)$ is a near-factorization of \mathbb{Z}_{ab+1} with $|A| = a$ and $|B| = b$, and conversely.

We use the following two results which follow immediately from [2].

Lemma 3.3. [2, Corollary 1] *Suppose (A, B) is an $(a^2 + 1, 2, a; 1)$ -SEDF in \mathbb{Z}_{a^2+1} . Then $-A = g + A$ and $-B = h + B$ for some $g, h \in \mathbb{Z}_{a^2+1}$.*

From Lemma 3.3, the following can be proven.

Lemma 3.4. [2, Proposition 2] *Suppose (A, B) is an $(a^2 + 1, 2, a; 1)$ -SEDF in \mathbb{Z}_{a^2+1} . Then there exists an element $g \in \mathbb{Z}_{a^2+1}$ such that $g + A = -(g + A)$ and $g + B = -(g + B)$.*

Lemma 3.4 is very useful. It tells us that we can restrict our attention to SEDFs (A, B) where $A = -A$ and $B = -B$, because any SEDF can be transformed into an SEDF of this form by a suitable translation. Such an SEDF will be termed *symmetric*.

Example 3.4. The two sets $A = \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ and $B = \{4, 8, 12, 16\}$ form a $(17, 2, 4; 1)$ -SEDF in \mathbb{Z}_{17} . If we compute $A' = A + 7 = \{7, 8, 9, 10\}$ and $B' = B + 7 = \{2, 6, 11, 15\}$, we obtain an SEDF (A', B') in which $A' = -A'$ and $B' = -B'$. Hence, (A', B') is symmetric.

For $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{a^2+1}$, define $P_x = \{x, -x\}$. We note that $|P_x| = 1$ if $x = 0$, or if a is odd and $x = (a^2+1)/2$, and $|P_x| = 2$, otherwise. It is clear that, in a symmetric $(a^2+1, 2, a; 1)$ -SEDF, say (A, B) , both A and B are a union of sets P_x .

Lemma 3.5.

1. *Suppose a is odd (so $a^2 + 1$ is even). Then $P_0 \subseteq A$ and $P_{(a^2+1)/2} \subseteq B$, or $P_0 \subseteq B$ and $P_{(a^2+1)/2} \subseteq A$. All other P_x 's contained in A or B have cardinality two.*
2. *Suppose that a is even (so $a^2 + 1$ is odd). Then A and B are both unions of P_x 's of cardinality two.*

Proof. When a is odd, both A and B must contain a P_x where $|P_x| = 1$. There are two P_x 's with $|P_x| = 1$ when a is odd. Because A and B are disjoint, it must be the case that one of P_0 and $P_{(a^2+1)/2}$ is contained in A and the other is contained in B .

When a is even, both A and B must contain an even number of P_x 's where $|P_x| = 1$. But there is only one P_x with $|P_x| = 1$ when a is even, namely, P_0 . It follows that neither A nor B contains P_0 . \square

3.2 Enumeration algorithm

We now describe the algorithm we used to enumerate the SEDFs that are presented in Table 1. An a -subset $A \subseteq X = \mathbb{Z}_{a^2+1}$ is said to have a *mate*, say B , if B is an a -subset of X such that $\mathcal{D}(B, A) = X \setminus \{0\}$. Of course B must be disjoint from A . Furthermore, by Lemma 3.5, we may assume that $A = -A$ and $B = -B$ (i.e., A and B are symmetric), and that both A and B are unions of sets P_x .

Lemma 3.6.

1. *Suppose $x \neq y$ and $|P_x| = |P_y| = 2$. Then*

$$\mathcal{D}(P_y, P_x) = \{y - x, -y - x, y + x, -y + x\} = P_{y-x} \cup P_{y+x}. \quad (1)$$

2. *Suppose $x \neq y$ and at least one of P_x and P_y has cardinality one. Then*

$$\mathcal{D}(P_y, P_x) = P_{y-x} = P_{-y-x} = P_{y+x} = P_{-y+x}. \quad (2)$$

Proof. Part 1. is obvious, so we just discuss part 2. Suppose $|P_y| = 1$. Then $2y = 0$. We have $\mathcal{D}(P_y, P_x) = \{y - x, y + x\}$. However, $(y - x) + (y + x) = 2y = 0$, so $y + x = -(y - x)$. It follows that $\mathcal{D}(P_y, P_x) = P_{y-x} = P_{-y-x} = P_{y+x} = P_{-y+x}$. The proof is similar when $|P_x| = 1$. \square

Given a fixed symmetric A , we want to choose P_y 's to place in potential mate B so $\mathcal{D}(B, A)$ contains all the distinct P_d 's ($d \neq 0$) once each. Let $\mathcal{P}(A) = \{P_x : P_x \subseteq A\}$.

When a is even, let $\mathcal{P} = \{P_x : 1 \leq x \leq a^2/2\}$, so $|\mathcal{P}| = a^2/2$. Here all sets P_x contained in $A \cup B$ have cardinality two.

For odd values of a , let $\mathcal{P} = \{P_x : 1 \leq x \leq (a^2 + 1)/2\}$, so $|\mathcal{P}| = (a^2 + 1)/2$. Note that $|P_{(a^2+1)/2}| = 1$. We can assume without loss of generality that $P_0 \subseteq A$ (i.e., $0 \in A$) and $P_{(a^2+1)/2} \subseteq B$ (i.e., $(a^2 + 1)/2 \in B$). This accounts for the difference $(a^2 + 1)/2$ in $\mathcal{D}(B, A)$. All other sets P_x contained in $A \cup B$ have cardinality two.

Suppose we regard A as fixed and we consider a possible $P_y \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}(A)$ to be placed in B . For a given $P_y \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}(A)$ and a given $P_d \in \mathcal{P}$, we will denote by $M_A[P_d, P_y]$ the number of P_x 's in A such that $P_d \subseteq \mathcal{D}(P_y, P_x)$. This defines a $|\mathcal{P}|$ by $|\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}(A)|$ matrix M_A . This matrix is basically a Kramer-Mesner matrix (see [8]) where the rows and columns are indexed by orbits under the action of the multiplicative group $\{1, -1\}$.

Lemma 3.7. *Suppose A is a subset of \mathcal{P} . Suppose $P_y \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}(A)$. Then*

$$M_A[P_d, P_y] = |\{P_x \subseteq A : P_x = P_{d \pm y}\}|. \quad (3)$$

Proof. Suppose that $P_x \subseteq A$ and $P_x = P_{d \pm y}$. Replacing x by $-x$ if necessary, we can assume $x = d \pm y$. If $x = d - y$, then $d = x + y$ and $P_d \subseteq \mathcal{D}(P_y, P_x)$ from (1) or (2). Similarly, if $x = d + y$, then $d = x - y$ and $P_d \subseteq \mathcal{D}(P_y, P_x)$.

Conversely, if $P_d \subseteq \mathcal{D}(P_y, P_x)$, then $d \in \{y - x, -y - x, y + x, -y + x\}$. We consider each possible case in turn:

- If $d = y - x$, then $x = y - d$ and $P_x = P_{-x} = P_{d-y}$.
- If $d = -y - x$, then $x = -y - d$ and $P_x = P_{-x} = P_{d+y}$.
- If $d = y + x$, then $x = d - y$ and $P_x = P_{d-y}$.
- Finally, if $d = -y + x$, then $x = d + y$ and $P_x = P_{d+y}$.

In each case, $P_x = P_{d \pm y}$. \square

We observe that, for given values of y and d , there are at most two possible values of x such that (3) is satisfied.

Let J be the all-1's vector of length $|\mathcal{P}|$. In the following theorem $U = (u[P_y])$ will be a vector of length $|\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}(A)|$ indexed by

$$\{P_y \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}(A)\}.$$

Theorem 3.8. *The matrix equation*

$$M_A U^T = J^T \quad (4)$$

has a $(0, 1)$ -valued solution U if and only

$$B = \bigcup \{P_y \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}(A) : u[P_y] = 1\}$$

is a mate to A .

Proof. Suppose U is a $(0, 1)$ -valued solution to the matrix equation (4). Define

$$B = \bigcup \{P_y \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}(A) : u[P_y] = 1\}.$$

We first observe that $B \cap A = \emptyset$. Let $d \neq 0$. Because (4) is satisfied, there must be a unique y such that $M_A[P_d, P_y]u[P_y] = 1$. Hence, $M_A[P_d, P_y] = u[P_y] = 1$. Because $u[P_y] = 1$, it follows from Lemma 3.7 that there is a unique $P_x \in A$ such that $P_d \subseteq \mathcal{D}(P_y, P_x)$. Hence B is a mate to A .

Conversely, suppose B is a mate to A and define U by $u[P_y] = 1$ if and only if $P_y \subseteq B$. Consider any $d \neq 0$. Because (A, B) is an SEDF, there is a unique $P_x \in A$ and $P_y \in B$ such that $P_d \subseteq \mathcal{D}(P_y, P_x)$. Hence there is a unique y such that $M_A[P_d, P_y]u[P_y] = 1$. It follows easily that (4) holds. \square

Remark 3.9. The matrix equation (4) has a $(0, 1)$ -valued solution if and only if there is a subset of the columns of M_A whose sum is J .

Remark 3.10. If a column of M_A contains an entry equal to 2, then the corresponding entry of U must equal 0 in any $(0, 1)$ -valued solution to the matrix equation (4).

Example 3.5. Suppose $a = 4$, so $a^2 + 1 = 17$, and suppose $A = \{P_1, P_3\}$. The matrix M_A has rows indexed by P_1, \dots, P_8 and columns indexed by $P_2, P_4, P_5, P_6, P_7, P_8$.

Consider the column labelled P_4 . Because $A = \{P_1, P_3\}$, we are interested in values d such that $P_1 = P_{d \pm 4}$ or $P_3 = P_{d \pm 4}$. In the first case, $d = 3$ or 5 ; in the second case, $d = 1$ or 7 . Hence, we have a 1 in rows P_1, P_3, P_5 and P_7 of column P_4 .

It can be checked that the column labelled P_5 has 1's in rows P_2, P_4, P_6 and P_8 . The sum of columns P_4 and P_5 of M_A gives the all-1's vector of length eight, so $B = \{P_4, P_5\}$ is a mate to A . This solution corresponds to the vector $U = (0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0)$.

The complete matrix M_A is as follows:

	P_2	P_4	P_5	P_6	P_7	P_8
P_1	2	1	0	0	0	0
P_2	0	0	1	0	0	0
P_3	1	1	0	1	0	0
P_4	0	0	1	0	1	0
P_5	1	1	0	1	0	1
P_6	0	0	1	0	1	1
P_7	0	1	0	1	1	1
P_8	0	0	1	1	1	1

Note that the column labelled P_2 has an entry equal to 2. To compute all the values in column P_2 , we find the values d such that $P_1 = P_{d \pm 2}$ or $P_3 = P_{d \pm 2}$. In the first case, $d = 1$ or 3 ; in the second case, $d = 1$ or 5 . Hence, we have a 2 in row P_1 and 1's in rows P_3 and P_5 .

Example 3.6. Suppose $a = 3$, so $a^2 + 1 = 10$, and suppose $A = \{P_0, P_1\}$. The matrix M_A has rows indexed by P_1, \dots, P_5 and columns indexed by P_2, P_3, P_4, P_5 . The complete matrix M_A is as follows:

	P_2	P_3	P_4	P_5
P_1	1	0	0	0
P_2	1	1	0	0
P_3	1	1	1	0
P_4	0	1	1	1
P_5	0	0	1	1

The sum of columns P_2 and P_5 of M_A gives the all-1's vector of length five, so $B = \{P_2, P_5\}$ is a mate to A . This solution corresponds to the vector $U = (0, 0, 0, 1, 1)$. Of course we already knew that it must be the case that $P_5 \subseteq B$.

It might be of interest to verify how the entries in column P_5 are computed, because $|P_5| = 1$. We find the values d such that $P_0 = P_{d\pm 5}$ or $P_1 = P_{d\pm 5}$. In the first case, $d = 5$, so we have a 1 in row P_5 . In the second case, $d = 4$ or 6 . Of course $P_4 = P_6$ and we only consider values of $d \leq 10/2 = 5$, so we have a 1 entry in row P_4 .

Solutions to the matrix equation $M_A U^T = J^T$ can be found using a variety of methods. We prefer the very fast backtracking algorithm using the “dancing links” data structure described in [7] that was implemented by Petteri Kaski and Olli Pottonen. It can be downloaded from the web page [6]. We note that, before running this algorithm, it is necessary to delete any columns that contain an entry equal to 2.

A pair (A, B) of a -element subsets of \mathbb{Z}_{a^2+1} is a $(a^2 + 1, 2, a; 1)$ -SEDF if B is a mate to A . Solutions to the matrix equation will yield many equivalent $(a^2 + 1, 2, a; 1)$ -SEDFs, where equivalence is defined as in Definition 3.2.

Let $v = a^2 + 1$, let $v_0 = \lfloor \frac{v-1}{2} \rfloor$ and let $a = \lfloor \frac{a}{2} \rfloor$. Because we may assume (A, B) is symmetric, we can assume that

$$A = \begin{cases} T \cup (v - T) & \text{if } a \text{ is even} \\ \{0\} \cup T \cup (v - T) & \text{if } a \text{ is odd,} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where T is an a_0 -element subset of $\{1, 2, \dots, v_0\}$ and

$$v - T = \{v - x : x \in T\}.$$

We also note that if A and B are symmetric, then mA and mB are also symmetric for any non-zero unit m in \mathbb{Z}_v^* .

1. For each a_0 -subset $T \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, v_0\}$, we construct A according to (5). If there is a unit $m \in \mathbb{Z}_v^*$ such that (in lexicographical order)

$$mA \stackrel{\text{LEX}}{\leq} A,$$

then we discard A and proceed to the next a_0 -subset T in $\{1, 2, \dots, v_0\}$; otherwise we process A .

2. For each A that is to be processed, we then compute M_A and find $(0,1)$ valued solutions to the matrix equation $M_A U^T = J^T$. Each such solution U corresponds to a mate B for A , yielding a symmetric SEDF, (A, B) .
3. Finally, we convert the SEDF (A, B) into canonical form as follows.

(a) We find

$$f_A(X) \in \text{AFF}(v) = \{x \mapsto \alpha x + \beta : \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_v \text{ and } \gcd(\alpha, v) = 1\}$$

such that $f_A(A) \underset{\text{LEX}}{<} g(A)$ for all $g \in \text{AFF}(v)$.

(b) We find

$$f_B(X) \in \text{AFF}(v) = \{x \mapsto \alpha x + \beta : \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_v \text{ and } \gcd(\alpha, v) = 1\}$$

such that $f_B(B) \underset{\text{LEX}}{<} g(B)$ for all $g \in \text{AFF}(v)$.

(c) If $f_A(A) \underset{\text{LEX}}{<} f_B(B)$, then we report $(f_A(A), f_A(B))$ as the canonical form solution; otherwise we report $(f_B(B), f_B(A))$.

4. Different SEDFs may have the same canonical form. Thus, as a final step, we remove the duplicate canonical form solutions.

We have enumerated all inequivalent $(a^2 + 1, 2, a, 1)$ -SEDFs in \mathbb{Z}_{a^2+1} , for $1 \leq a \leq 14$. These are presented in Table 1. For each SEDF, we present a symmetric representation and the canonical representation, along with the affine mapping that transforms the symmetric representation to the canonical representation. The symmetric representation uses the notation P_x defined above. If we apply the specified affine mapping modulo $a^2 + 1$ to every element of the symmetric representation, we obtain the given canonical representation.

Table 1: Inequivalent $(a^2 + 1, 2, a, 1)$ -SEDFs in \mathbb{Z}_{a^2+1}

number	solution	mapping
3.1	$\{P_0, P_1\}, \{P_2, P_5\}$ $\{0, 1, 2\}, \{3, 6, 9\}$	$X+1$
4.1	$\{P_1, P_3\}, \{P_4, P_5\}$ $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}, \{4, 8, 12, 16\}$	$8X+10$
4.2	$\{P_1, P_4\}, \{P_2, P_8\}$ $\{0, 1, 4, 5\}, \{6, 8, 14, 16\}$	$6X+11$
5.1	$\{P_0, P_1, P_2\}, \{P_3, P_8, P_{13}\}$ $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}, \{5, 10, 15, 20, 25\}$	$X+2$
6.1	$\{P_1, P_3, P_5\}, \{P_6, P_7, P_{18}\}$ $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}, \{6, 12, 18, 24, 30, 36\}$	$18X+21$
6.2	$\{P_1, P_2, P_{17}\}, \{P_4, P_{10}, P_{16}\}$ $\{0, 1, 2, 6, 7, 8\}, \{9, 12, 21, 24, 33, 36\}$	$2X+4$

Table 1: (continued)

number	solution	mapping
7.1	$\{P_0, P_1, P_2, P_3\}, \{P_4, P_{11}, P_{18}, P_{25}\}$ $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}, \{7, 14, 21, 28, 35, 42, 49\}$	X+3
8.1	$\{P_1, P_3, P_5, P_7\}, \{P_8, P_9, P_{24}, P_{25}\}$ $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7\}, \{8, 16, 24, 32, 40, 48, 56, 64\}$	32X+36
8.2	$\{P_1, P_6, P_8, P_{15}\}, \{P_5, P_{13}, P_{23}, P_{24}\}$ $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11\}, \{12, 16, 28, 32, 44, 48, 60, 64\}$	28X+38
8.3	$\{P_1, P_4, P_{13}, P_{16}\}, \{P_2, P_8, P_{26}, P_{32}\}$ $\{0, 1, 4, 5, 16, 17, 20, 21\}, \{22, 24, 30, 32, 54, 56, 62, 64\}$	22X+43
9.1	$\{P_0, P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4\}, \{P_5, P_{14}, P_{23}, P_{32}, P_{41}\}$ $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8\}, \{9, 18, 27, 36, 45, 54, 63, 72, 81\}$	X+4
9.2	$\{P_0, P_1, P_8, P_9, P_{10}\}, \{P_{11}, P_{14}, P_{17}, P_{38}, P_{41}\}$ $\{0, 1, 2, 9, 10, 11, 18, 19, 20\}, \{21, 24, 27, 48, 51, 54, 75, 78, 81\}$	X+10
10.1	$\{P_1, P_3, P_5, P_7, P_9\}, \{P_{10}, P_{11}, P_{30}, P_{31}, P_{50}\}$ $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9\}, \{10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, 90, 100\}$	50X+55
10.2	$\{P_1, P_2, P_{32}, P_{35}, P_{36}\}, \{P_{11}, P_{16}, P_{31}, P_{38}, P_{43}\}$ $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14\}, \{15, 20, 35, 40, 55, 60, 75, 80, 95, 100\}$	3X+7
11.1	$\{P_0, P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4, P_5\}, \{P_6, P_{17}, P_{28}, P_{39}, P_{50}, P_{61}\}$ $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10\}, \{11, 22, 33, 44, 55, 66, 77, 88, 99, 110, 121\}$	X+5
12.1	$\{P_1, P_3, P_5, P_7, P_9, P_{11}\}, \{P_{12}, P_{13}, P_{36}, P_{37}, P_{60}, P_{61}\}$ $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11\}$ $\{12, 24, 36, 48, 60, 72, 84, 96, 108, 120, 132, 144\}$	72X+78
12.2	$\{P_1, P_6, P_{27}, P_{34}, P_{55}, P_{62}\}, \{P_8, P_{22}, P_{31}, P_{45}, P_{54}, P_{68}\}$ $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17\}$ $\{18, 24, 42, 48, 66, 72, 90, 96, 114, 120, 138, 144\}$	57X+93
12.3	$\{P_1, P_2, P_4, P_5, P_{68}, P_{71}\}, \{P_7, P_{19}, P_{31}, P_{43}, P_{55}, P_{67}\}$ $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23\}$ $\{24, 30, 36, 60, 66, 72, 96, 102, 108, 132, 138, 144\}$	48X+98
12.4	$\{P_1, P_3, P_{13}, P_{15}, P_{17}, P_{19}\}, \{P_{20}, P_{21}, P_{28}, P_{29}, P_{68}, P_{69}\}$ $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29\}$ $\{30, 36, 42, 48, 78, 84, 90, 96, 126, 132, 138, 144\}$	72X+82
12.5	$\{P_1, P_3, P_{21}, P_{23}, P_{25}, P_{27}\}, \{P_{28}, P_{29}, P_{36}, P_{37}, P_{44}, P_{45}\}$ $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 12, 13, 14, 15, 24, 25, 26, 27\}$ $\{28, 32, 36, 64, 68, 72, 100, 104, 108, 136, 140, 144\}$	72X+86
12.6	$\{P_1, P_2, P_{17}, P_{20}, P_{35}, P_{38}\}, \{P_4, P_{10}, P_{16}, P_{58}, P_{64}, P_{70}\}$ $\{0, 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 24, 25, 26, 30, 31, 32\}$ $\{33, 36, 45, 48, 81, 84, 93, 96, 129, 132, 141, 144\}$	8X+16
12.7	$\{P_1, P_{10}, P_{19}, P_{35}, P_{44}, P_{53}\}, \{P_{12}, P_{15}, P_{25}, P_{52}, P_{56}, P_{62}\}$ $\{0, 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 36, 37, 38, 42, 43, 44\}$ $\{45, 48, 57, 60, 69, 72, 117, 120, 129, 132, 141, 144\}$	16X+22

Table 1: (continued)

number	solution	mapping
13.1	$\{P_0, P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4, P_5, P_6\}, \{P_7, P_{20}, P_{33}, P_{46}, P_{59}, P_{72}, P_{85}\}$ $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12\}$ $\{13, 26, 39, 52, 65, 78, 91, 104, 117, 130, 143, 156, 169\}$	X+6
14.1	$\{P_1, P_3, P_5, P_7, P_9, P_{11}, P_{13}\}, \{P_{14}, P_{15}, P_{42}, P_{43}, P_{70}, P_{71}, P_{98}\}$ $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13\}$ $\{14, 28, 42, 56, 70, 84, 98, 112, 126, 140, 154, 168, 182, 196\}$	98X+105
14.2	$\{P_1, P_2, P_{38}, P_{41}, P_{77}, P_{78}, P_{80}\}, \{P_{19}, P_{26}, P_{43}, P_{64}, P_{71}, P_{81}, P_{88}\}$ $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20\}$ $\{21, 28, 49, 56, 77, 84, 105, 112, 133, 140, 161, 168, 189, 196\}$	5X+10

As an example to illustrate an affine mapping, consider solution 4.2 in Table 1. The given symmetric form is

$$A = \{P_1, P_4\} = \{1, 4, 13, 16\}, \quad B = \{P_2, P_8\} = \{2, 8, 9, 15\}.$$

The canonical form is

$$6A + 11 = \{0, 1, 4, 5\}, \quad 6B + 11 = \{6, 8, 14, 16\}.$$

It is obtained from the mapping $X \mapsto 6X + 11$ in \mathbb{Z}_{17} .

All of the SEDFs listed in Table 1 turn out to be α -valuations. In Table 2, the column labelled “sequence” indicates the ℓ -values used in a sequence of blowup operations that yield each SEDF. The solution numbers correspond to the ones in Table 1. In every case, we begin with a BLOWUP II operation and then alternate BLOWUP I and BLOWUP II operations. Note that the sequence of blowup operations for a given solution is not necessarily uniquely determined.

4 SEDFs in dihedral groups

We will be studying SEDFs and near factorizations in dihedral groups, so it is convenient to switch to multiplicative notation. If S and T are subsets of a multiplicative finite group G with identity e such that

$$ST = \{st : s \in S, t \in T\} = G \setminus \{e\},$$

then we say that (S, T) is a *near factorization* of G . Near factorizations were, to our knowledge, first studied in de Caen *et al.* [2]. That paper was motivated by the problem of factoring $J - I$ into a product of $(0, 1)$ matrices. Indeed, if R is a subset of the group G , we may define the matrix $M : G \times G \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ by $M[g, h] = 1$ if $gh^{-1} \in R$ and 0 otherwise. Then a near factorization $G - e = ST$ provides the $(0, 1)$ matrix factorization $M(S)M(T) = M(G \setminus \{e\}) = J - I$, where J is the matrix of all 1’s.

Table 2: SEDFs and Blowup Sequences

number	blowup sequence	number	blowup sequence
3.1	(3, 3)	4.1	(4, 4)
4.2	(2, 2, 2, 2)	5.1	(5, 5)
6.1	(6, 6)	6.2	(3, 2, 2, 3)
7.1	(7, 7)	8.1	(8, 8)
8.2	(2, 2, 4, 4)	8.3	(2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2)
9.1	(9, 9)	9.2	(3, 3, 3, 3)
10.1	(10, 10)	10.2	(5, 2, 2, 5)
11.1	(11, 11)	12.1	(4, 2, 3, 6)
12.2	(3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3)	12.3	(3, 2, 4, 6)
12.4	(12, 12)	12.5	(4, 3, 3, 4)
12.6	(6, 2, 2, 6)	12.7	(2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3)
13.1	(13, 13)	14.1	(14, 14)
14.2	(7, 2, 2, 7)		

An $(n, 2, k, 1)$ -strong external difference family (or $(n, 2, k, 1)$ -SEDF) in the multiplicative group G is a pair of disjoint k -subsets (A_1, A_2) of G , such that the multiset

$$\{xy^{-1} : x \in A_1, y \in A_2\}$$

contains each element of $G - e$ exactly once. Thus $A_1A_2^{-1} = G - e$ and hence (A_1, A_2^{-1}) is a near factorization. Consequently, a $(n, 2, k, 1)$ -SEDF in G is equivalent to a near factorization of G with both factors having size k . Observe that

1. if $ST = G - e$, then $T^{-1}S^{-1} = (ST)^{-1} = (G - e)^{-1} = G - e$; and
2. if $ST = G - e$ and $g, h \in G$, then $(gSh)(h^{-1}Tg^{-1}) = gSTg^{-1} = g(G - e)g^{-1} = G - e$.

Hence we say that (S, T) , (T^{-1}, S^{-1}) and $(gSh, h^{-1}Tg^{-1})$ are all *equivalent* near factorizations of G .

4.1 Example

We present an example based on [2]. Let D_{13} be the dihedral group of order 26 with generators a, b and relations $a^2 = 1$, $b^{13} = 1$ and $aba = b^{-1}$.

1. The elements of D_{13} are

$$\{a^i b^j : i = 0, 1 \text{ and } j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, 12\}.$$

They can be depicted by the following diagram:

$i =$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
b^i													
ab^i													

2. Remove the identity and enter the sequence 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 five times, starting in a^1 and wrapping around the end, finishing at b .

$i =$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
b^i		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2
ab^i	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3

3. Partition the cells into tiles of the same shape that each contain exactly one cell of each type.

$i =$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
b^i		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2
ab^i	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3

4. Let A be the group elements in the leftmost tile:

$$A = \{b, b^2, ab^2, ab, a\}.$$

Each tile has a “notch.” Let B be the group elements corresponding to these notches:

$$B = \{e, ab^5, b^5, ab^{10}, b^{10}\}.$$

Then $AB = D_{13} \setminus \{1\}$ and hence it is a near factorization:

\cdot	e	ab^5	b^5	ab^{10}	b^{10}
b	b	ab^4	b^6	ab^9	b^{11}
b^2	b^2	ab^3	b^7	ab^8	b^{12}
ab^2	ab^2	b^3	ab^7	b^8	ab^{12}
ab	ab	b^4	ab^6	b^9	ab^{11}
a	a	b^5	ab^5	b^{10}	ab^{10}

Consequently (A, B^{-1}) is an $(26, 2, 5, 1)$ -SEDF in D_{13} .

The same method of construction will produce a near factorization of D_{2n} into factors A and B , whenever $|A| \times |B| = 2n - 1$.

4.2 An equivalent construction

In Huczynska *et al.* [4, Example 4.1], the following construction for an $(26, 2, 5, 1)$ -SEDF (A_1, A_2) in D_{13} is provided:

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= \{e, a, b, ab, b^2\} \\ A_2 &= \{ab^2, b^5, ab^7, b^{10}, ab^{12}\} \end{aligned}$$

It is easily verified that (A_1, A_2^{-1}) is a near factorization of D_{13} :

$$A_2^{-1} = \{ab^2, b^8, ab^7, b^3, ab^{12}\}$$

and

\cdot	ab^2	b^8	ab^7	b^3	ab^{12}
e	ab^2	b^8	ab^7	b^3	ab^{12}
a	b^2	ab^8	b^7	ab^3	b^{12}
b	ab	b^9	ab^6	b^4	ab^{11}
ab	b	ab^9	b^6	ab^4	b^{11}
b^2	a	b^{10}	ab^5	b^5	ab^{10}

Diagramming A_1 and A_2^{-1} we have the following:

$i =$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
$A_1 :$	b^i												
	ab^i												

$i =$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
$A_2^{-1} :$	b^i												
	ab^i												

Visually, the pattern for A_1 and A_2^{-1} seems to be the same for A and B . The bottom row needs shifting and the diagram needs to be flipped. To see this algebraically let $h = ab^2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 h &= \{e, a, b, ab, b^2\}h \\ &= \{e, a, b, ab, b^2\}ab^2 \\ &= \{ab^2, b^2, ab, b, a\} \\ &= A \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (A_2 h)^{-1} &= h^{-1} A_2^{-1} = h A_2^{-1} = ab^2 \{ab^2, b^8, ab^7, b^3, ab^{12}\} \\ &= \{e, ab^{10}, b^5, ab^5, b^{10}\} \\ &= B. \end{aligned}$$

Hence [4, Example 4.1 (ii)] and the example in Section 4.1 are equivalent.

4.3 General result

The construction generalizing the example in Section 4.1 appears in [2] as follows: If k is a divisor of $2n - 1$, then we have the near factorization $D_n - 1 = AB$, where

$$A = \{b^i : 1 \leq i \leq \frac{k-1}{2}\} \cup \{ab^i : 0 \leq i \leq \frac{k-1}{2}\}$$

and

$$B = \{b^{ik} : 0 \leq ik < n\} \cup \{ab^{ik} : 0 < ik < n\}.$$

Here, we are interested in $(k^2 + 1, 2, k, 1)$ -SEDFs in $D_{(k^2+1)/2}$, So we specialize to $2n - 1 = k^2$ and obtain:

$$A = \{b^i : 1 \leq i \leq \frac{k-1}{2}\} \cup \{ab^i : 0 \leq i \leq \frac{k-1}{2}\}$$

and

$$B = \{b^{ik} : 0 \leq i \leq \frac{k-1}{2}\} \cup \{ab^{ik} : 1 \leq i \leq \frac{k-1}{2}\}.$$

The following construction of a $(k^2 + 1, 2, k, 1)$ -SEDF (A_1, A_2) in $D_{(k^2+1)/2}$ was published in [4, Theorem 4.2].

$$A_1 = \{b^i : 0 \leq i \leq \frac{k-1}{2}\} \cup \{ab^i : 0 \leq i \leq \frac{k-3}{2}\}$$

$$A_2 = \{b^{ik} : 1 \leq i \leq \frac{k-1}{2}\} \cup \{ab^{ik+\frac{k-1}{2}} : 0 \leq i \leq \frac{k-1}{2}\}$$

Theorem 4.1. *In $D_{(k^2+1)/2}$, the dihedral group of order $k^2 + 1$, the near factorization (A, B) of $D_{(k^2+1)/2}$ and the $(k^2 + 1, 2, k, 1)$ -SEDF (A_1, A_2) are equivalent.*

Proof. Let $h = ab^{\frac{k-1}{2}}$. Then $b^i h = ab^{(k-1-2i)/2}$ and $ab^i h = b^{(k-1-2i)/2}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 h &= \left(\{b^i : 0 \leq i \leq \frac{k-1}{2}\} \cup \{ab^i : 0 \leq i \leq \frac{k-3}{2}\} \right) h \\ &= \left(\{b^i h : 0 \leq i \leq \frac{k-1}{2}\} \cup \{ab^i h : 0 \leq i \leq \frac{k-3}{2}\} \right) h \\ &= \left\{ ab^{(k-1-2i)/2} : 0 \leq i \leq \frac{k-1}{2} \right\} \cup \left\{ b^{(k-1-2i)/2} : 0 \leq i \leq \frac{k-3}{2} \right\} \\ &= \{ab^i : 0 \leq i \leq \frac{k-1}{2}\} \cup \{b^i : 1 \leq i \leq \frac{k-1}{2}\} \\ &= A. \end{aligned}$$

And

$$\begin{aligned}
(A_2h)^{-1} &= h^{-1}A_2^{-1} = hA_2^{-1} = h\left(\left\{b^{ik} : 1 \leq i \leq \frac{k-1}{2}\right\} \cup \left\{ab^{ik+\frac{k-1}{2}} : 0 \leq i \leq \frac{k-1}{2}\right\}\right)^{-1} \\
&= h\left(\left\{b^{-ik} : 1 \leq i \leq \frac{k-1}{2}\right\} \cup \left\{ab^{ik+\frac{k-1}{2}} : 0 \leq i \leq \frac{k-1}{2}\right\}\right) \\
&= \left\{hb^{-ik} : 1 \leq i \leq \frac{k-1}{2}\right\} \cup \left\{hab^{ik+\frac{k-1}{2}} : 0 \leq i \leq \frac{k-1}{2}\right\} \\
&= \left\{ab^{\frac{k-1}{2}-ik} : 1 \leq i \leq \frac{k-1}{2}\right\} \cup \left\{b^{ik} : 0 \leq i \leq \frac{k-1}{2}\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

We now use that the identity $e = b^n$ and the assumption that $2n - 1 = k^2$ to see that $b^{-1} = b^{k^2}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
h^{-1}A_2^{-1} &= \left\{ab^{\frac{k+k^2}{2}-ik} : 1 \leq i \leq \frac{k-1}{2}\right\} \cup \left\{b^{ik} : 0 \leq i \leq \frac{k-1}{2}\right\} \\
&= \left\{ab^{\left(\frac{k+1}{2}-i\right)k} : 1 \leq i \leq \frac{k-1}{2}\right\} \cup \left\{b^{ik} : 0 \leq i \leq \frac{k-1}{2}\right\} \\
&= \left\{ab^{ik} : 1 \leq i \leq \frac{k-1}{2}\right\} \cup \left\{b^{ik} : 0 \leq i \leq \frac{k-1}{2}\right\} \\
&= B.
\end{aligned}$$

□

This near factorization and the equivalent SEDFs are the only known examples in non-abelian groups.

5 Summary

There remain some interesting open problems. We mention some of them now.

1. Does there exist an $(a^2 + 1, 2, a, 1)$ -SEDF in \mathbb{Z}_{a^2+1} that is not affine-equivalent to an α -valuation?
2. Is there a simple way to characterize when two sequences of blow-up operations yield affine-equivalent SEDFs?
3. Is there a generalization of α -valuations that would provide constructions of $(a^2 + 1, 2, a, 1)$ -SEDFs in non-cyclic groups?
4. Do there exist nonequivalent SEDFs in dihedral groups?
5. Does there exist an SEDF in a non-abelian group that is not a dihedral group?

References

- [1] J. Bao, L. Ji, R. Wei and Y. Zhang. New existence and nonexistence results for strong external difference families *Discrete Mathematics* **341** (2018), 1798–1805.
- [2] D. de Caen, D.A. Gregory, I.G. Hughes and D.L. Kreher. Near-factors of finite groups. *Ars Combin.* **29** (1990), 53–63.
- [3] S. Huczynska and M. Paterson. Existence and non-existence results for strong external difference families. *Discrete Mathematics* **341** (2018), 87–95.
- [4] S. Huczynska, C. Jefferson and S. Nepšinská. Strong external difference families in abelian and non-abelian groups. *Cryptography Commun.* **13** (2021), 331–341.
- [5] J. Jedwab and S. Li. Construction and nonexistence of strong external difference families. *J. Algebr. Comb.* **49** (2019), 21–48.
- [6] P. Kaski and O. Pottonen. Libexact. <http://pottonen.kapsi.fi/libexact.html>.
- [7] D.E. Knuth, *Dancing Links*. In “Millennial Perspectives in Computer Science”, J. Davies, B. Roscoe, and J. Woodcock, Eds., Palgrave, Basingstoke, England, 2000, pp. 187–214.
- [8] E. Kramer and D. Mesner. t -designs on hypergraphs. *Discr. Math.* **15** (1976), 263–296.
- [9] K.H. Leung, S. Li and T.F. Prabowo. Nonexistence of strong external difference families in abelian groups of order being product of at most three primes. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory A* **178** (2021), 105338.
- [10] K.H. Leung and T.F. Prabowo. Some nonexistence results for (v, m, k, pq) -strong external difference families. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory A* **187** (2022), 105575.
- [11] W.J. Martin and D.R. Stinson. Some nonexistence results for strong external difference families using character theory. *Bull. Inst. Combin. Appl.* **80** (2017), 79–92.
- [12] M.B. Paterson and D.R. Stinson. Combinatorial characterizations of algebraic manipulation detection codes involving generalized difference families. *Discrete Math.* **339** (2016), 2891–2906.
- [13] M.B. Paterson and D.R. Stinson. Circular external difference families, graceful labellings and cyclotomy. *Discrete Math.* **347** (2024), article 114103, 15 pp.
- [14] A. Rosa. On certain valuations of the vertices of a graph. In: P. Rosenstiehl (ed.) *Theory of Graphs (International Symposium, Rome, 1966)*, pp. 349–355 (1967).
- [15] J. Wen, M. Yang, F. Fu and K. Feng. Cyclotomic construction of strong external difference families in finite fields. *Designs, Codes and Cryptography* **86** (2018), 1149–1159.